UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,625	09/04/2003	Frank Dawidowsky	282723US8X	7983
	7590 05/07/200 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE ST	REET	FOUD, HICHAM B		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2419		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/656,625	DAWIDOWSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HICHAM B. FOUD	2419	

	HICHAM B. FOUD	2419	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed).	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	**	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	* **	empliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-13 and 15.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe , and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10.	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Wing F. Chan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419 5/4/09	/Hicham B Foud/ Examiner, Art Unit 2419	ı	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The additions/deletions to the claims such as claim 1 raise new issues.

Continuation of 13. Other: In response to the argument of claim 10 in the Remarks page 13, it is noted that the claimed subject matter of claims 1 and 3 are not the same subject matter of the argued claim 10. Thus, the claims cannot be argued the same way. Moreover, the Remarks lack argument in regard of claim 10 because the applicant should submit an argument under the heading "Remarks" pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions. Applicant must also discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them. Finally, the rejection is based on obvioussness. Therefore, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981) (see the 103 rejection in the previous action).